

### REMARKS

Claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9 and 14 – 24 remain in the application and are rejected. Claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9, 14 and 19 – 21 are amended herein. Claims 1, 5 and 10 – 13 are previously canceled. New claims 25 and 26 are added. No new matter has been added.

Claims 2, 3, 14 – 17, 19 – 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,825,943 to Barry et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,050 to Motamed et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,434,967 to Tannenbaum. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,460 to Hohensee et al. Claims 6, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al. and Motamed et al. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al. and Motamed et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,364,050 to Noyes. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,016,061 to Hewitt and U.S. Patent No. 6,219,151 to Manglapus. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum in further view of Manglapus. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum in further view of Hewitt.

Responding to the previous amendment, the Office Action relies on Motamed et al. to show multiple print head drivers passing processed data over multiple bidirectional *networks*, relying on the assertion that “Motamed '050 further discloses that the RIPs are connected to the print engines through one or more video print machines 64 via a high speed interconnect bus 74 (col. 7, lines 26-35).” Page 2. Applicants note that using video print machines through a high speed interconnect bus is quite different than, and neither teaches or suggests: transferring signals packaged in a transport protocol; nor

transferring signals over a commercially available network(s). Neither does any reference of record.

Accordingly, claims 6, 9, 14 and 20 are amended to recite that the sequencer packages “together parsed page local and global state data portions in a transport protocol as work units;” (claim 6, lines 4 – 5, claim 9, lines 7 – 8, claim 14, lines 8 – 9 and claim 20, lines 9 – 10). This is supported in the specification which provides that “embodiments of the present invention will be **described with reference to** a particular **transport level protocol** (also referred to as a carrying protocol or communications protocol), i.e., transmission control protocol (TCP), ... .” Paragraph 0018 (emphasis added). One does not package data in a transport protocol for high speed interconnect bus. New claims 25 – 26 recite, and claims 19 and 21 are amended to recite, that “said transport protocol is transmission control protocol (TCP).” Claims 2 – 4 are amended responsive to the amendment to claim 14 and for clarity. No new matter is added.

Claims 6 – 8, 14 and 20 are amended further to recite that the network(s) is(are) a commercially available network(s). This is supported in the specification which provides that “as commodity processors and **commercially available networks** are improved, the performance can be increased in a straightforward manner.” Paragraph 0010 (emphasis added). No new matter is added.

Neither Motamed et al. nor any other reference of record teaches or suggests a high performance printer packaging “parsed page local and global state data portions in a transport protocol” (*supra*) that may be TCP for transfer over a commercially available network(s) as the claims recite. Therefore, Motamed et al. in combination with Barry et al. and Tannenbaum, alone or further in combination with any other reference(s) of record neither teaches, suggests nor results in the present invention as recited in claims 2, 3, 14 – 17, 19 – 21 and 23, as amended, and all claims depending therefrom including new claims 25 and 26.

Further, neither does Hohensee et al., Manglapus, Hewitt or Noyes add what is missing from Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum to result in the present invention as recited in claims 6, 9, 14 and 20, as rejected or as amended. Therefore, Barry et al., Motamed et al. and Tannenbaum in further combination with Hohensee et al., Manglapus, Hewitt and/or Noyes neither teaches, suggests or results in the present invention as recited in claims 4, 6 – 9, 18 and 22, as amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 3, 14 – 17, 19 – 21 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a), and consideration of new claims 25 and 26, is respectfully requested.

The applicants thank the Examiner for efforts, both past and present, in examining the application. Believing the application to be in condition for allowance, both for the amendment to the claims and for the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider and allow new claims 25 and 26, reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2 – 4, 6 – 9 and 14 – 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allow the application to issue.

As previously noted MPEP §706 “Rejection of Claims,” subsection III, “PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER DISCLOSED BUT NOT CLAIMED” provides in pertinent part that

If **the examiner** is satisfied after the search has been completed that patentable subject matter has been disclosed and the record indicates that the applicant intends to claim such subject matter, he or she **may note** in the Office action that **certain aspects or features** of the patentable invention have not been claimed and that if properly claimed such claims **may be given favorable consideration**. (emphasis added.)

The applicants continue to believe that the written description of the present application is quite different than, and not suggested by, any reference of record. Accordingly, should the Examiner believe anything further may be required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below for a telephonic or personal interview to discuss any other changes. Please charge any

AMENDMENT  
May 16, 2011

BLD920020007US1  
Serial No. 10/065,745

deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to IBM Corporation Deposit  
Account No. 50-3669 and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully Submitted,

May 16, 2011  
(Date)

/Charles W. Peterson, Jr., #34,406/  
Charles W. Peterson, Jr.  
Registration No. 34,406

Customer No. 56,989  
Law Office of Charles W. Peterson, Jr.  
12793 Thacker Hill Ct.  
Suite 1B  
Oak Hill, VA 20171  
Telephone: (703) 481-0532  
Facsimile: (703) 481-0585